

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 10, 2007, the Examiner objected to claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 17, 18, and 19; rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,766,454 to Riggins; and rejected claims 6, 8, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0002526 to Dias et al. (Dias).

By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 17, 18, and 19 to overcome the objections regarding informalities. Applicant submits that the amendments obviate the basis of the Examiner's objections. Applicant also amends claims 1, 2, and 19 to more clearly define the features of those claims and amends claim 9 to correct a minor typographical error.

Claims 1-19 are currently pending.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7, 9-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Riggins. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Riggins at col. 4, lines 10-14 discloses the following feature of claim 1: "assigning one or more of a plurality of types with each web service." However, a careful review of the cited reference reveals that Riggins at col. 4, lines 10-14 is completely silent with respect to the noted feature of claim 1. Instead of disclosing the noted feature of claim 1, Riggins discloses "services" including an "e-mail service program, and address book service program, a calendar service program, a paging service program, [and] a company database service program." Riggins, col. 4, lines 10-14. Conspicuously absent from Riggins is any mention of actually assigning types to a web service. Accordingly, Riggins fails to disclose at least the following feature of claim 1: "assigning one or

more of a plurality of types with each web service." Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Riggins, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, because Riggins fails to assign types to a web service, Riggins cannot possibly disclose "in response to a client running the application, sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application," as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Riggins, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Riggins at col. 5, lines 29-42, col. 6, lines 17-24, and col. 8, lines 61 - col. 9, line 4 discloses the following feature of claim 1: "in response to a client running the application, sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application." However, Riggins at col. 5, lines 29-42 merely discloses security applets rather than a list, col. 6, lines 17-24 merely discloses forwarding a web page, and col. 8, lines 61 - col. 9, line 4 merely discloses an HTML web page including "services." None of the citations relied upon by the Examiner discloses sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application, much less "in response to a client running the application, sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application," as recited in claim 1. For this additional reason, Riggins fails to disclose this noted feature of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Riggins, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claim 1 and claims 2-5, 7 and 9, at least by reason of their dependency from independent claim 1, should be withdrawn for this additional reason.

Independent claims 10 and 19, although of different scope, include features similar to those of independent claim 1. Dependent claims 11-15 depend from independent claim 10. For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, claims 10 and 19 are not anticipated by

Riggins. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of claims 10 and 19 as well as claims 11-15, at least by reason of their dependency from claim 10, should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 8, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Riggins in view of Dias. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 6 and 8 each depend from claim 1 and each recite all the features therein including "assigning one or more of a plurality of types with each web service" and "in response to a client running the application, sending a list identifying one or more web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application." For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Riggins fails to disclose or suggest these features. Moreover, although Dias discloses "OCI," Dias fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Riggins. Accordingly, neither Riggins nor Dias, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests these noted features. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 15 and each recite all the features therein including, among other things, "in response to a client opening one of the applications, sending a list identifying one or more external web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application." For at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Riggins fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Moreover, although Dias discloses "OCI," Dias fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Riggins. Accordingly, neither Riggins nor Dias discloses or suggests this noted feature. Therefore, the rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-359/2003P00068US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9 November 2007

/PFS/

Pedro F. Suarez
Reg. No. 45,895

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.320.3040
Fax: 858.320.3001